

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing proposed amendment and the following remarks.

As a result of the proposed amendment, claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, 16, 21 and 24 are pending. Applicants propose amending claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 16 and 21 and newly canceling claims 2, 10 and 23 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 9, 13-14, 16, 19, 21-22 and 24

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 9, 13-14, 16, 19, 21-22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,418,411 to Gong in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,670 to Kosanovic. Applicants submit that amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 obviate the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of dynamic re-configurable speech recognition. The method includes, among other things, determining parameters of a background model and a transducer model at a periodic time during a received voice request and increasing the periodic time when successive changes in sampled noise information or sampled transducer information do not exceed a threshold. Independent claims 4, 9, 13 and 14 recite similar features.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action of March 1, 2006, the Examiner stated, “the examiner notes that an amendment including updating a speech recognition model based on both a transducer and background models, wherein the updating period of both models are increased when successive changes in corresponding noise or transducer information do not exceed a threshold value, would overcome the prior art of record.” Applicants propose amending independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 in accordance with the Examiner’s above-mentioned statement and submit that proposed amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reason provided by the Examiner on

page 3 of the Final Office Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 and dependent claims 16, 19, 21, 22 and 24 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12 and 23

On page 7 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gong in view of Kosanovic, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,008,941 to Sejnoha. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments to claims 1, 5 and 9 obviate the rejection. Applicants submit that the proposed cancellation of claims 3, 10 and 23 without prejudice or disclaimer render the rejection moot with respect to these claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 10 and 23 be withdrawn.

Proposed amended independent claims 1, 5 and 9 are patentable over Gong in view of Kosanovic for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that Sejnoha fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Gong and Kosanovic. Therefore, amended independent claims 1, 5 and 9 are patentable over Gong, Kosanovic and Sejnoha. Claims 3, 4, 6-8 and 11-12 depend from one of claims 1, 5 or 9 and are patentable over Gong, Kosanovic and Sejnoha for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1, 5 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3-4, 6-8 and 11-12 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing proposed amendment and submit that, upon entry of the proposed amendment, the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 18, 2006

By: Richard C. Irving

Correspondence Address:

Samuel H. Dworetzky
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433